

hemisphere does not get frigidly cold and many people that live in the southern hemisphere are not forced to move because of the increased heat.

To give some example of this, if you look in this area of Canada, you know that it is quite cold there. But if you go right across the Atlantic Ocean and visit England, you will know that the weather is quite moderate. In fact, the weather in England is often and most often is much more moderate than much further in latitude to the south and mid-Atlantic part of the United States.

If you look at the Scandinavian countries and their latitude, in Labrador you will see that their climate is more moderate than the climate we see on that latitude in North America. The reason for this is the ocean has currents that take warm from the equatorial regions to the northern regions that moderate their temperature. At the same time, when those warm waters reach the north, because they get colder and because of the salinity they drop to the ocean bottom and come to the south. As they gradually warm, they rise, because we know that warm air rises and colds air falls. Well, that is the same thing that happens with water.

Part of what I am trying to explain here is that there is a constant dispute about whether or not there is such a thing as global warming. Is the climate changing? Does human activity put more greenhouse gasses into the atmosphere to cause a warming in the atmosphere?

What I would like to do in just a brief minute here is to explain the fact that there is clear, unequivocal evidence that the ocean surface water is warming. As a result of that, there is more evaporation in the equatorial regions of the ocean. With more evaporation, that means there is more rain further north, and so the northern ocean is becoming more fresh.

Now what does that mean? What that means is, as the ocean current moves from the equatorial regions north in its current and it moves into the northern hemisphere, as the water becomes more fresh, it becomes less dense. That means it will sink a lot slower. As the water evaporates more, it leaves more saltwater in the southern hemisphere, less saltwater in the northern hemisphere.

There are two things that cause this ocean current to occur, fresh water and salinity. As the ocean water becomes more salty, it sinks up here; and when it sinks to the bottom, it returns down to the equatorial regions like we have here. When the ocean becomes saltier up here and more or less saltier, that water sinks.

Without becoming too complicated, the phenomenon is that the ocean currents are changing as a result of the increase in temperature of surface water. The increase in temperature of surface water is happening because, over the last 40 years, the warmth or the in-

crease in temperatures in the atmosphere is moving up.

Now, whether or not you think there is more CO₂, more greenhouse gasses, is almost at this point beside the point, because the fact of the matter is here, over the last 40 years, temperatures on the planet have been increasing, thereby causing the temperatures of the surface of the ocean to increase. As a result of that increase in temperature of the ocean, we are actually redistributing fresh water and saltwater so we are having an effect on ocean current.

Saltwater, the density of salt, the amount of fresh water in its distribution of the ocean are fundamental to moving water from one place to another. As a result of that, as a result of the current moving in this way, the cycle of ocean current is slowing down; and when the cycle of currents slow down there is less warm water moving north and less cold water moving south. The result of that, this region of the United States receiving less warm water, this region of Europe is moving into an era when it is becoming colder. So that is a counterintuitive observation when you consider that the Earth is getting warmer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SAFEGUARDING ASSETS FOR EMPLOYEES IN BANKRUPTCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the Safeguarding Assets for Employees in Bankruptcy Act, along with my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

The SAFE in Bankruptcy language is designed to protect workers' claims when their employer files for bankruptcy.

My bill would create a priority for claims arising under the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification,

or what is commonly known as the WARN Act. The WARN Act requires an employer to provide 60-days notice to workers before closing its doors. If a company fails to comply with the law and gives fewer than 60-days notice, workers are entitled to salary and benefits, according to the Federal legislation, for up to 60 days. My legislation provides a priority for those claims of 60 days in bankruptcy court.

When a company closes its doors and files for bankruptcy, the effects on the employees and the community are often devastating. A number of my constituents have lost their jobs at the Fannie May Candy Company in Chicago, which has closed its doors and filed for bankruptcy. These employees, many of whom had loyally served the company for decades, up to 37 years, were provided with only 10 days notice before they lost their jobs.

Too often, companies hope to duck their responsibilities of 60 days of pay under the WARN Act by filing for bankruptcy, assuming that the claims for the workers would be paid last and only if there is any money left to all the others owed in the estate. My legislation makes these claims a priority, ensuring that companies will think twice before ignoring their responsibilities to employees under Federal law.

In addition, my legislation provides a long overdue increase in the wage cap for employees from \$4,000 to \$20,000 and eliminates the lookback periods for these claims. The current lookback period limits the recovery of benefits to those earned within the last 90 days, which unfairly penalizes employees whose benefits have accrued over a longer period.

As in the case of Fannie May, the contract said for every year of employment they would get one week of severance pay. Well, we have employees that were there for 37 years, and they are getting nothing.

These small reforms are designed to soften the blow to employees who have had the rug pulled out from under them without warning. Unfortunately, in the current economy, this problem is not limited to my constituents but is occurring in every district.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting these needed reforms for the loyal workers of Fannie May and other hard-working employees across the country. I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that when a company closes its doors and does not even follow Federal law under the WARN Act and gives them the 60 days, they simply walk into court and say, we filed bankruptcy, now we do not have to pay them the 60 days, that those employees that were owed 60 days are properly adjusted in bankruptcy court.

That is what my legislation wishes to do to honor the work of hard-working Americans.

With that, I will bring this up to the desk and introduce this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAUPREZ). Under a previous order of